

From: Allen Hochstetler [mailto:hawker@jcis.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:57 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: proposal 2-XA

To all concerned about our marine environment:

In a day when reason and sound science do not always arbitrate our best decisions, proposal 2-XA gives us a chance to support an initiative backed by all of us who want good and long lasting solutions to a healthy and vibrant marine environment for all to enjoy for generations to come. Please join me in supporting proposal 2-XA.

Allen Hochstetler

From: Benjamin Platt [mailto:kaybeefish@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for Proposal 2XA

SALMON TROLLERS MARKETING Association
PO BOX 137
Fort Bragg, CA. 95437

March 31,

2008

To the members of the Blue Ribbon Task force and the Fish and Game Commission,

Last fall I asked Tom Estes if he would be interested in representing our Ft. Bragg fishermen on the regional stakeholder group. Since accepting a stakeholder position, he has devoted considerable time and energy to this process and we believe that he and the other stakeholders have arrived at a proposal that we can all live with. Proposal 2XA meets or exceeds the requirements of the Marine Life Protection Act and will not result in unfair and unnecessary economic loss to fishing interests. It also seems to be satisfactory to other interest groups, like divers, coastal landowners and sportfishers.

It is important that the people who finally make the decision on which proposal to adopt realize that, along with the sea life they seek to protect, many human lives are also affected by these decisions. Our coastal communities have been nurtured for generations from the sea's bounty and continue to provide significant income and a way of life to many of our inhabitants. Today's fisheries are all managed at sustainable levels and have minimal impact on the ocean's ecosystem. As people who make our living from the sea and provide the highest quality fresh seafood for Californians, we urge you to adopt proposal 2XA, which will allow us to continue these traditions.

My organization especially urges you to allow trolling for salmon and crab pot fishing in all but the most delicate areas, as these methods of fishing are proven sustainable and virtually non-disruptive to the ocean floor.

Sincerely,

Ben Platt

for the Salmon Trollers Marketing Association Board of Directors

From: Bill Dutra [mailto:wdutra@owensfinancial.com]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 2:50 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: FW: Support 2-XA

I am a third generation Californian from a family of 12 (yes, the number is 12) children. As you can imagine, money was a bit scarce growing up. What we could afford usually involved trips camping and fishing in California; from the beaches to the mountain lakes and streams. My parents, as well as most of my siblings, still live in California and enjoy outdoor pursuits. You could say that we have our own little family multiplier as it pertains to our expenditures on recreation in this state. There are now 21 grandchildren (surely more will follow) who are being taught their parent's love of fishing, hunting, camping, etc.

We would all respectfully suggest that you **STRONGLY** consider implementing MLPA proposal 2-XA. This proposal seems to be the only proposal which acknowledges the socio-economic impacts of the reserves you are establishing. It is the most balanced proposal, and certainly the only proposal which attempts to fairly provide recreational access to folks like my family and future generations. In addition, it is the only proposal which preserves access to cherished areas near the safety of harbors, a necessity when the afternoon wind starts to blow.

This process should be implementing the wishes of the people of California, not special interest groups which want to remove us from the water.

Thank you for considering our feedback.

Bill Dutra

Sr. Vice President

From: Bill Dutra [mailto:wdutra@owensfinancial.com]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 2:40 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Support 2-XA

[embedded picture of letter did not transfer]

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Hays [<mailto:BHAYS@ci.watsonville.ca.us>]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:46 AM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

As a Sports fisherman for the last 57 years in California, I ask you to please approve proposal 2-XA. It is getting harder to find a place to fish and I work so that I can do my job and that is fishing and hunting and support our natural resources. If all the fishing is taken away from us, the persons that are the real care takers - fishermen and fisherwomens - will stop support what they can not enjoy and all will be lost forever. My child and their child will not be able to enjoy, support and take care of our fishing resources..

please see the following as more support reasons for proposal 2-XA:

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

 Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA  Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines  Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support  Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups  Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster  Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the High level of protection.  Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.  Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.  Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

 Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef is the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

 Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

 Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations  Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely under represented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

 Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Thank you for taking care of our resources and hope you make the correct decisions.

From: William Martin [mailto:William.Martin@flextronics.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 2:03 PM
To: MLPACComments; governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Cc: Billy95044@aol.com; William Martin
Subject: MPA Blue Ribbon Task Force

To whom it may concern;

As a Californian and avid Outdoorsman, I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA.

This proposal is a well thought out and has a balanced approach to achieve conservation goals with the least impact economically on the commercial and recreational fisheries here in our great State of California.

I want as much as anyone to have fish for my children and grandchildren and a strong Ocean Ecosystem. Many of the other Proposals achieve this goal with little regard for the socio-economic impact to fishermen or the fishing industry!

Proposal 2-XA will achieve the conservation goals without putting Commercial fishermen, Party Boats, and Bait Shops out of Business and allow us; as sport fishermen and women to enjoy the sport we so love....

Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced, reasonable solution.

Thank you for your time,

Billy Martin
San Jose, CA

"Tenacious commitment to continuous improvement"

From: Bob Jautz [mailto:goldbug@sonic.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:33 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please support 2-XA

Gentlemen,

I've fished out of Bodega over 30 years and realize how serious the salmon situation is. This proposal is the best one in my opinion. Secondly, why not have at least a limited season at Cordell Banks? When I suggested this to a Fish & Game guy at the Santa Rosa meeting he said "That's the nursery." I say nonsense. Rick Powers knows more about Cordell than anyone I know recently said that he's never seen so many fish out there. Every pinnacle was loaded. Without a salmon season the pressure on rock cod will be enormous and that area could be fished.

Yours truly,
Bob Jautz
Santa Rosa, Ca.

From: Bvancuren@aol.com [mailto:Bvancuren@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 3:51 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Adoption of MLPA Proposal 2-XA

I have been a fisherman in California for 50 years. I have been following the MLPA process as it pertains to the North Central Region.

Proposal 2-XA in my opinion meets all the goals of the MLPA, the DFG feasibility guidelines and is very enforceable. Proposal 2-XA has the support of the recreational fishermen, divers and commercial fishermen.

I recommend you adopt proposal 2-XA

Bob Van Curen

From: Bob Wilson [mailto:bwilson@cityofmadera.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 11:31 AM
To: MLPAComments; governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

I have been fishing the waters the Delta and off the California coast for 30 years. In this time I have seen the steady deterioration of the sport. I agree that some measure is needed to preserve and provide for the future of fishing. Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. It is the only proposal to have broad

support from a wide range of fishing user groups placing an emphasis on total ecosystem.

BobWilson
Madera, CA

From: Lane Buxton [mailto:lane_buxton@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:53 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: proposal 2-XA

Greetings,

Our family is in support of proposal 2-XA. We have a long history of fishing off the Pacific Coast, and believe 2-XA provides the needed balance of conservation and consumptive uses.

The Buxton Family

From: chdonley2@netscape.net [<mailto:chdonley2@netscape.net>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:12 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA North Coast Siting

To Whom It may Concern:

As a long time salt water fisherman i support proposal 2-XA and believe it provides the best balance between access to recreational use of this area and conservation.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input into the process.

Chuck Donley, boat name, "Dessert First"
(life is uncertain, eat dessert first)

From: Cliff Hart [<mailto:cliff@humboldtinvestigations.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:51 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA- North Central Zone - Proposal 2-XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force, Governor, and Secretary Chrisman,

I am in full support of proposal 2-XA. I have concerns for the other proposals having significant economic impacts on commerical and recreational interests, and the only proposal that appears to be balanced with conservation in mind is proposal 2-XA. All goals are reached with this proposal and should be the choice for all interest groups. Thank you for your time.

Cliff Hart
Phone: (707) 441-1906

From: Doug Jenkins [mailto:jenkins.doug@gene.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:01 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject:

To Blue Ribbon Task Force Administration,

This letter is to inform you that I support Proposal 2-XA.

As a lifetime fisherman with a advanced degree in Science I have great concern and interest in the environment, and recognize the importance and need to effectively balance the environment and recreational needs of California residence.

Regards,
D. Jenkins

From: Dale Sims [mailto:Dale@cleanfish.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:24 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Marine Life protection Act

BRTF:

My company, CleanFish Inc., based in San Francisco, is an ardent supporter of sustainable, artisan fisheries and fishermen. We also support establishing Marine Reserves. I urge you to approve Proposal 2X-A in its current form, with no amendments. We need Marine Reserves and we also need sustainable fishing practices. The best practices for sustainable commercial fishing come from small, artisan dedicated hook and line fishermen. Sustainability of our ocean's resources must also include economic sustainability of and for our coastal communities. It is my understand that Proposal 2X-A does that.

Please support @X-A.

Thank you,

Dale Sims
Vice-President/Co-Founder
CleanFish, Inc.
San Francisco, CA

From: Dan Connolly [mailto:dconnolly@lawsonmechanical.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 6:51 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support Proposal 2-XA

Ladies/Gentlemen,

As a California fisherman I strongly support proposal 2-XA as vital to the environment and the economy.

Thank you
Dan Connolly

From: Dan Wolford [mailto:danwolford@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 4:09 PM
To: MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Coastside Support for Proposal 2-XA

The enclosed letter is Coastside Fishing Club's formal endorsement of proposal 2-XA as the preferred option:

1 April, 2008

MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force
c/o California Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

Support For Proposal 2-XA

As I am sure you know, members of the Coastside Fishing Club have been active participants throughout the process on the North Central Coast. Several of our members have been on the Regional Stakeholder Group; and either directly or in concert with our partners – The Partnership for Sustainable Oceans, we have supported the Science Advisory Team members and process, we have entered into discussions with the BRTF, with the Fish and Game Commission, and with the Governor's office. We were extremely pleased that we were able to transition our external proposal inside the RSG process when it was merged with the Jade proposal, and we were pleased to help it become Proposal 2-XA. We are now pleased to support 2-XA, and request that it be selected as the preferred alternative.

We believe the following points strongly argue that Proposal 2-XA should be selected as the preferred alternative:

- Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers.
- Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA.

- Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster.
- Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the “High” level of protection.
- Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
- Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.
- Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and has broad public support.
- Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.
- Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components, has the support of many in the conservation community.

Contrasting Proposal 2-XA with other proposals demonstrates many significant differences, particularly with regard to socioeconomic impacts to the recreational fishing sector and the communities we support and depend on:

- Proposal 4 would essentially prohibit recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important bottom fishing area north of Point Conception and severely impact recreational fishing out of San Francisco Bay.
- Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.
- Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations.
- Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.
- Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for nonconsumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, which when coupled with the private lands to the south, becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in the massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.
- Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups.

From the onset of the MLPAI process, Coastside has consistently worked to implement strong conservation measures that recreational fishermen can support. We have worked extremely hard to find the “sweet spot” that achieves the appropriate balance between restricting and allowing access, and to incorporate only those activities which are appropriate to the desired levels of protection. We have reached out to many user and

stakeholder groups, working with all who would come to the middle with us, to find the middle ground that meets the intent and the spirit of the MLPA. Proposal 2-XA finds that sweet spot.

This has been an arduous process, but with the emergence of Proposal 2-XA, we are pleased to recommend that the BRTF not only pass it forward to the Commission for final consideration, but that it be passed forward as the preferred option. We thank you for your consideration.

Dan Wolford, Science Director

orig /s/ Dan Wolford

Coastside Fishing Club

From: Dave Andree [<mailto:davingb@webtv.net>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:24 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

please consider the 2-XA proposal we are very limited to where we can fish already . the fishing seasons seem to be getting shorter anyway.
thanks for your time.
Dave Andree

-----Original Message-----

From: Dave [mailto:d_privatel@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 11:50 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: supporting Proposal 2-XA

I am writing you in support of the 2-XA proposal which will provide real conservation and still protect our fishing.

Thanks,

Dave Lanza

From: DCFishlips@cs.com [<mailto:DCFishlips@cs.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:37 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA

To: The Blue Ribbon Task Force

As a life long fisherman, and one who cares about the environment, I urge you to support Proposal 2-XA. This proposal is well balanced and thought out.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
David Cosimano

From: Dennis Plog [<mailto:djplog@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:17 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: Govenor Arnold Schwarzenegger; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force:

As a Fisheries Biologist (graduated from Humboldt State University) and an avid Recreational Fisherman, I urge you to support Proposal 2-XA. It achieves all of the MLPA scientific and conservation goals without driving all of the fishing related businesses along this section of coastline out of business. This could effectively close a large section of coastline to the small boat Recreational Fisherman. As recent surveys have shown, this was not the intent of the Public when they voted to pass the MLPA Initiative.

Please consider the socioeconomic impacts of your decisions as you move forward with this process.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Dennis Plog.

From: White, Dennis [<mailto:DJW@JMBM.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:09 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: To Blue ribbon task force MLPA

I support proposal "2-XA" because:

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

1. Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA;
2. Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines;

3. Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support;
4. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups;
5. Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster;
6. Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection;
7. Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range;
8. Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers;
9. Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

1. Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef - the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.
2. Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.
3. Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations ;
4. Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.
5. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network.
6. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary.

7. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis White
Berkeley, CA

Holder of both Commercial and recreational CA DFG licenses

From: don94526@aol.com [mailto:don94526@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:14 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-xa

I support 2-XA.

Don Crose
Danville, Ca.

From: Don Larkin [mailto:goodhue1@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:50 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA.

I am writing to urge your adoption of alternative 2-XA. As a lifelong conservationist and recreational fisherman I see it as the best alternative for protecting the resource and still providing reasonable opportunities for fishing. Proposal 2-XA is fair and does not result in unsustainable monetary burdens on the commercial or recreational fishermen. Additionally 2-XA meets the goals of the scientists and creates the necessary marine reserves that are required for responsible conservation.

I have spent many enjoyable hours on the water with my children and look forward to many more with them and my grandchildren. 2-XA will ensure that my grandchildren will have a healthy resource in the future and also provide opportunities in the present for myself and my children to fish and enjoy our beautiful area.

Sincerely,
Don Larkin
Inverness CA

From: dm [mailto:icsol@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 5:59 PM
To: MLPAComments; governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA support for option 2-XA

Governor Schwarzenegger
Mike Chrisman
Members of the MLPA Committees

Dear Sirs:

I am asking for a common sense implementation of the MLPA which allows reasonable commercial and recreation fishing but addresses the conservation goals. I believe this is best represented by option 2-XA. Please support this option for the implementation of the MLPA's

Best Regards,

Douglas Mow
50 year resident of California

From: Frank Schulze [mailto:Frank@rogers-young.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:45 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: govenor@govenor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Dear MLPA: I'm writing you to inform you that I support Proposal 2-XA. I hope that the Blue Ribbon Task Force will support this proposal and get it passed to save our Salmon Fisheries. I'm an avid sport fisherman and am now introducing and bringing up my grand children into the outdoor sport that I and they truly love. I want to save this for them and all the future generations that love the outdoors and fishing. It is a shame as to what has happened here in California with this fisheries and we all must do our part to save it and bring it back to it's past glory. If we work together this is attainable. The 2-XA Proposal is the most fair and far reaching to start this process and correct the wrong that has been done to this sport. Please support this proposal for all Californians. Thank you for time.

Sincerely.

Frank E. Schulze

From: Gail Wilkinson [mailto:gailwilkinson@pacbell.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:42 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Approve Proposal 2-XA

BRTF

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups

From: Pat Lindbergh [mailto:mikipl@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:32 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support Proposal 2XA

Please support Proposal 2XA in the ongoing MLPA Process. This is a most fair and balanced first step forward in the process. It will allow some continued safe access to our Ocean Environment while rehabilitating a damaged Fishery. Other Proposals, #4 in particular, appear to have an objective of making our Ocean off limits to California recreational boaters-as access and use within range of safe harbor is all but eliminated. These radical Proposals would have Californian's sell or store Boats and close our Business'es with the shut down of Ocean access. Please support 2XA and allow some continued recreational Ocean useage while problems in our rivers and Delta which have damaged our Fishery over the years are maybe finally addressed.

Thank You.
Sincerely Yours,

Gary and Patricia Lindbergh

From: Gary Grube [mailto:gary.grube@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 6:39 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Prop. 2XA

Blue Ribbon Task Force Members,
I've lived in California for 13 years after relocating with my company, (FormFactor, Inc.) from New York state. At that time, we were a "start-up" company with new technology that was to re-shape a section of the semiconductor industry. The company grew and one point had 1200 employees throughout the world with all the manufacturing being done in California. I was one of the fortunate few who had early stock options so when our company had an IPO, the first thing I did was purchase a brand new sport fishing boat. Since then, I've thoroughly enjoyed every opportunity that I could find, to be out on the ocean with family & friends doing what we love, fishing!

Besides the purchase of the boat, came all of the necessary gear that one tends to need if you are to be safe and somewhat successful at this sport. I've made a particular point to try and only purchase tackle, supplies, get my boat serviced, get my trailer serviced, gas, food and drink from local shops so that they would be able to continue to do so, and also provide friendly tips and locations when asked.

Coastside Fishing Club has also been a valuable part of my life and while I may not be able to devote as much time to all of the activities the club and some members do, I will support the message of the club, because it is one of my own.

Please consider this one captain's request and vote yes for proposition 2XA!

Regards,
Gary Grube

From: Bon Appetit [mailto:bon_appetit@filemaker.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:03 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In support of 2-XA guidelines

In support of 2-XA guidelines

I am a recreational fisherman who supports plan 2 the Coastside Conservation Plan for the MPLA. I feel that the Plan 2xa will provide the only way. If plan 1-3 or 4 are implemented we (my family) will be unable to ocean fish.

The "other" plans have pushed out the fishing grounds too far for my young fishermen. For instance the launch at Pillar Point the proposed Red zone (no take) is right adjacent to the harbor while the Blue "Take Zone" is stacked further north making a simple trip out for dabs or halibut a dangerous proposition for the small private boater. The only other alternative that could work for us is out the gate to fish Duxberry Buoy but the proposed no take zone is stacked in the same fashion as Pillar Point the no take RED zone is closest to the harbor with the blue hatched (take zone) positioned much farther north. We are talking about kids that love the ocean why are we even considering making it more dangerous for them to enjoy the waters you are "trying to save for them"? The oceans belong to all of us and as a member of the Coastside Fishing Club I teach each child that fishes with me about the need to conserve the resource and respect the wildlife. My youngest asked me if she will ever be able to catch a big halibut like his brother and I could not answer. Please support the Plan 2xa as presented as I feel it is the only viable option that allows me to share the ocean with my boys Don't let environmental extremists steal my boys future.

Sincerely

Graziano Luciani

From: Bon Appetit [mailto:bon_appetit@filemaker.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:45 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In support of 2-XA guidelines

In support of 2-XA guidelines

I'm sending this letter in support of proposal 2-XA 2-XA meets department of fish & Game scientific and Feasibility guidelines

Sincerely

Graziano Luciani

From: Howard Arnold [mailto:bellarose337@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:39 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: RECREATIONAL SALMON SEASON

Hello,

Having fished in California for over fifty years, I have seen the decline in our fishery to the point that it is today. I am sure there are several factors that have contributed to this decline and all of us need to share some of the blame for letting it fall to where it is today. However, the complete closure of the salmon fishing is not the answer to this overall issue. Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers. The proposal will benefit all of the parties concerned without limiting the fishing completely.

To not have either a commercial or recreational salmon season would be devastating to the economy in California that is all ready suffering severe economic issues. We need to all work together to find a solution to this problem without a blanket elimination of the salmon season.

Sincerely,

Howard M. Arnold
Vacaville, CA

From: Hunt Conrad [mailto:hunt@cds1.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:49 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: mlpa

Please support the 2xa proposal and give us back the faith that our government works for the people not the politicians.

Hunt conrad

From: Jack_Gross@amat.com [mailto:Jack_Gross@amat.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:04 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: My Support for MLPA Proposal 2-2XA

As a conservation minded fisherman and Dad of a 13 year old son who loves to fish, please drive Proposal 2-2XA through closure and acceptance.

If, for nothing else, do this for the sake of PUBLIC SAFETY. Going fishing in our ocean waters requires special equipment and expert knowledge. Even with this, you can be placed in a very unsafe environment due to weather changes. The other MLPA proposals would make it more difficult to transit to and from open fishing areas.

In addition, our State's constitution allows for public access to fishing by us, the taxpaying and voting public. Below is a quote from our constitution. Please do not take these important rights away from us. And please allow Proposal 2-2XA to pass so we don't risk our lives to go fishing off of San Francisco.

Sincerely,
Jack Gross
Coastside Fishing Club

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE 1 DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

Section 25. The people shall have the right to fish upon and from the public lands of the State and in the waters thereof, excepting upon lands set aside for fish hatcheries, and no land owned by the State shall ever be sold or transferred without reserving in the people the absolute right to fish thereupon; and no law shall ever be passed making it a crime for the people to enter upon the public lands within this State for the purpose of fishing in any water containing fish that have been planted therein by the State; provided, that the legislature may by statute, provide for the season when and the conditions under which the different species of fish may be taken.

From: James Dunton [mailto:alph@sonic.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:43 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA Proposal 2 X-A

Dear Friends,

After having read all of the reasons that Proposal 2 X-A fits the needs and wants of all the parties concerned, I can only conclude that it is the best. It is imperative that you too do the right thing, and what is best for all.

Thank you,
James E Dunton
Forestville
California

From: webster01@comcast.net [mailto:webster01@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:30 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: www.keepamericaifishing.org@mx1.ceres.ca.gov
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

March 3, 2008

The Blue Ribbon Task Force.

I'd like to voice my support for Proposal 2-XA. After reviewing the available options I'm convinced that this proposal offers the best balance of conservation and user interests. My primary interest is preserving these resources for recreational use but I'm also aware that a sensible conservation strategy is necessary. I urge you to recognize the components of Proposal 2-XA as the fairest approach to preserving these valuable resources while providing limited recreational, consumption activity.

Sincerely,

James Webster
Pleasant Hill, Calif.

From: Jasper Kwan [mailto:triton_38@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 11:32 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support of MLPA Proposal 2-XA

March 28, 2008

To all whom it may concern,

I am writing today in support of MLPA proposal 2-XA. My name is Jasper Kwan, I have been a resident of the bay area since my birth in 1981. Of my 26 years on this earth, 22 of them have been spent fishing our local waters, from San Francisco Bay to our beautiful coast.

Fishing these waters has given me some of the greatest times of my life. It began with my father teaching me the basics of fishing, and as I grew, we grew together as fishermen. I have spent many hours fishing with my closest friends, and many more by myself. Fishing has introduced me to many new people from all walks of life, most of which I must say are nice, hard working, respectful individuals. Fishing has taught me patience and has given me a respect for our fishery, wildlife, ocean, and bay. These experiences that I have gained throughout the years mean the world to me and would not be traded for anything.

For these reasons I must adamantly support proposal 2-XA. It is the best proposal of the group, as it is balanced and achieves the goals set out by the MLPA as well as the Department of Fish and Game. It is also the proposal with the broadest range of support by different fishing user groups, not because it benefits fishermen, but because it offers the most balance between usability and ecosystem protection. Truth be told, the entire MLPA process is a sham, one that has blindsided fishermen and has unfairly and maybe even illegally had it's goals pushed forward via money, connections, and power.

It is with my deepest concern that I urge you not only to consider 2-XA, but to really think about what you are trying to accomplish. If it is protection of our fish and wildlife in the ocean, there are many things that need fixing. Your attention should be focused on reducing pollution,

SMARTER fishing regulations, curtailment of commercial fishing catch rates, enforcement of fishing regulations, protection of off shore waters from foreign commercial fishing entities, habitat restoration, habitat creation, etc. etc.

I realize that the aforementioned are harder to work on and harder to fix, but that does not entitle the powers that be to take the shortcut and close off areas of open water to millions of people.

In closing I would like to again urge you to select 2-XA. As a fisherman I enjoy many days of the year out on the water, which in turn puts many dollars into our fishing industry and economy. As a recreational fisherman I consider myself a conservationist and steward of the bay and ocean. I hope to share my experiences with my future children as my father did with me. There is nobody who cares more about the protection of our fishery as much as a recreational fisherman.

Kind regards,

Jasper Kwan

From: Jim Volberding [mailto:jamiv925@hotmail.com]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:08 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

March 31, 2008

MLPA BRTF members,

I believe in conservation of our ocean resources. Proposal 2-XA meets the criteria for conservation. It also takes access, small boat safety into account. The proposal was a joint effort and looked at the overall picture of the MLPA. It is scientifically sound and meets the spacing and size requirements. It provides a sound plan for the subregions in the North Central Zone. Please accept and forward proposal 2-XA to the Fish and Game Commission.

Thank You,
James Volberding

From: Linda Hennessey [mailto:lindh@astound.net]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 6:20 PM

To: MLPAComments

Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman

Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To the honorable Blue Ribbon Task Force:

As a recreational fisherman I am in favor of Proposal 2-XA. I feel it balances conservation yet still allows for the enjoyment of the recreational fisherman. I feel at the present time the recreational fisherman is being unjustly targeted in the conservation of the fisheries. Proposal 2-XA seems to strike the best balance possible at this time meeting both the goals of the MLPA and recreational fisherman.

Sincerely,
Joe Hennessy

From: John Blair [mailto:jblair@executivestrategies.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:44 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support Proposal 2-XA

Dear Task Force Members,

I strongly urge you to support Proposal 2-XA in your upcoming vote. I have been a recreational fisherman for more than 50 years and based on that experience, I believe that Proposal 2-XA is the 'least-worst' alternative to address a difficult situation. It is the most balanced option which addresses both conservation requirements and socioeconomic impacts on commercial and recreational fishermen.

Of all the proposals offered, 2-XA achieves the greatest number of the MLPA scientific and conservation goals and the DFG guidelines. Further it is the most enforceable and I believe will be the most likely to gain the support of the various communities/groups involved.

Thank you for your consideration.
Kind Regards
-John Blair

From: John Bosley [mailto:JBosley@bosleyelec.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 11:44 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: MLPAComments
Subject: MPLA Proposed MPA 2-XA

Even though I find the acronyms confusing and hard to keep track of I have done my best to evaluate the different proposed MLPA's. As an avid ocean fisherman, I am very disappointed in what has happened this year to our salmon season. I keep a boat at Pillar Point Harbor and have paid my dock fees only to have nothing to fish for. I do not want to have this same thing happen to all of our fishing. It was my plan this year to take my grandchildren salmon fishing. Now that won't happen. I am also a scuba diver and have used this activity to evaluate the different proposals. With the fishing and diving in mind I would like to show my support for MPA 2-XA. I believe this proposal is best for all. Please consider this when making your decision.

Thank you,

John Bosley

1916 - U St.,

Rio Linda, CA 95673

From: John Long [mailto:john@hayridetohell.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:42 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA

Please accept my support for Option 2-XA. I began fishing the inland and offshore waters of California with my grandfather and father and continue to do so with my daughter and nieces and nephews. We have always practiced conservation to preserve the waters and marine life for generations to come. Option 2-XA seems to be the best option with the happiest balance.

Regards,
John Long

From: JetAzul2@aol.com [mailto:JetAzul2@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:22 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA comments

As a native Californian who has fished on the ocean since the age of twelve I ask that you consider and select option 2-XA as the only option which will protect our coast and it's fisheries yet allow fishermen and women and children the right to participate in a healthy outdoor activity. I was fortunate to have had an uncle who took me under the Golden Gate for my first ocean trip, yet some options such as proposal 4 will virtually end recreational fishing out of San Francisco Bay. Opine option_ does meet the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA yet allows me to take my nieces and nephews for their first fishing trip under the Golden Gate just like my uncle took me thirty-five years ago. Please select option 2-XA, thank you for your consideration.

John Towne
San Jose, CA

From: Joseph Conte [mailto:jcontemail@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 5:46 PM
To: MLPAComments; Governor; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Fw: Coastsiders, it's time

Please help us support 2-XA

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA
Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines
Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the “High” level of protection.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Major differences between 2-XA and other proposals:

Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef – the most important fishing area north of Point Conception and mean the virtual end of fishing out of San Francisco Bay.

Proposal 4 creates an MPA between Half Moon Bay and Ano Nuevo (in the Central Coast study area) which is not needed to meet SAT conservation guidance, with devastating impacts to Pillar Point harbor and users.

Proposal 2-XA has good solutions at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay whereas Proposal 4 would be devastating for the small boater and actually creates unsafe situations

Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef (an area protected by natural winds and typically rough water) resulting in a disproportionate impact to an area that was severely underrepresented on the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to create an underwater park at Sea Ranch specifically designed for non-consumptive divers while leaving open the traditional public access used by consumptive divers south of Stewarts Point, and when coupled with the private lands to the south becomes a keystone MPA in the overall network. Proposals 13 and 4 impact recreational and commercial users to the highest degree by extending their SMR out to the state waters boundary. Only Proposal 2-XA has struck a real balance in this part of the study area which is reflected in a massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

From: Kevin_Lee@URSCorp.com [mailto:Kevin_Lee@URSCorp.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:20 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-xa

To whom it may concern

I am a life long California resident who is very concerned about what I consider to be the few remaining reasons to stay in Ca. . access to our coastal waters and its resources. Sportfishing is a favorite pasttime of our early European settlers as well as Native Americans. To this day, saltwater sportfishing pumps millions of dollars into the local economy, but most of all, it provides good clean, wholesome fun for grandfathers and grandchildren, co-workers, friends and neighbors. Closing portions of our coastline is a huge step backwards for the California citizens who enjoy it. Its a sad time when politics and special interest groups (Packard Foundation) can control a natural resource. No one cares more about the health of our coast like the sportfisherman who want to make sure their kids kid can enjoy it like they did. I strongly support option 2-xa.

Kevin

From: Lisa Connolly [mailto:lconnolly@lyleco.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:11 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support Proposal 2-XA

Ladies/Gentlemen,

As a California fisherman I strongly support proposal 2-XA as vital to the environment and the economy.

Thank you
Lisa Connolly

From: maiertim@comcast.net [<mailto:maiertim@comcast.net>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 11:24 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Supporting Proposal 2-XA

Yesterday, I drove over to the coast through Half Moon Bay and north to Princeton. The beauty of our ocean always amazes me, and the diversity of the people who use our ocean. I love to walk around Pillar Point Harbor and see all the fishing boats both commercial and recreational and feel blessed I live in such beautiful state. However, this diverse economic model may cease to be, if Proposal 2-XA is not approved by the California Fish and Game. This Proposal 2-XA is the most balance of all three proposals, and considers that all Californians have access to and can use our great natural resource.

The MPLA process requires the use of scientific data to support the final proposal, and I feel Proposal 2-XA does this better than the other two proposal. We can only have good conservation measures when using good scientific data, verses emotional arm waving. California is a great state with great natural resources, let us please make sure we protect this valuable treasure for all Californians to use in a safe manner.

I also fear that if Proposal 2-XA does not pass, then the livelihood of many of the small business along the coast will come to an end, creating an economic wasteland and a major unemployment issue in the coastal communities. Please think carefully through the economic impacts.

Thanks for all the time and effort you have put into this MPLA Initiative.

From: Zammit, Marc [mailto:MarcZ@bamco.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 2:40 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

marc zammit | Bon Appetit Management Co.

From: voyager@dslextreme.com [mailto:voyager@dslextreme.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:47 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA for recreational fisherman

To Whom it may concern,

I work for a small marine center(Voyager Marine) and we sell recreational fishing boats in San Jose, Ca. The only hope for this business to survive The salmon colapse is to have a viable bottom

fishery. The bottom draggers are the reason for the rockfish numbers, why punish the recreational fisherman and the industry that support them. Please don't put me out of a job, support Proposal 2-XA.

Mark G. Messer

From: Marsha Wilgis [mailto:whited@saber.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) of the Marine Life

PLEASE READ THIS LETTER INTO THE RECORD:

If we must have restriction of fishing on the Northern California coast, I SUPPORT PROPOSAL 2-XA which has struck the greatest balance and is fairest to local residents, land owners, fishermen and conservationists alike.

I hope you take into consideration the value of my property being in close proximation with the ocean and it's access on my behalf. My family has made a very large investment in a ocean going pleasure craft in order to enjoy sport fishing. Taking away these values directly affects one of the main reasons we decided to live on the Northern California coastline.

From personal experience of my family, I have come to the conclusion your group should immediately address the seal population and remove the protection provided to those animals. I believe this is the most destructive element to the well being of marine life on the Northern California coastline.

I have read all the material that has been in the newspapers over the years, and nowhere have public agencies addressed what is ACTUALLY causing the demise of the salmon. I cannot see how you can facilitate a program to save the marine life if you don't actually know the cause. In many instances I see my rights being tread upon

by environmentalists, some who would put pants on cows and let them roam freely wherever they want to go. I question their input as actually wanting to save the fish. Of all things God gave man to eat, he gave them fish.

You owe it to all who use these fisheries to consider their rights as citizens of the area and get rid of the politics of the situation. Taking away sport fishing is absurd. If anyone has a right...including the seals, then surely I have a right to the few salmon I take from the ocean each year. Sport fishermen are not out there plying the waters day and night and take few fish considering all other elements.

When you last reduced the taking of fish which most likely would spawn in the Delta, I read numerous articles of how the fishermen in the Delta were landing large salmon hands over fists. Hard to understand your balance when it comes to enforcement of conservation. We couldn't catch them here, but those in the waters of the Delta could? Made no sense.

My suggestion would be to sell licenses and attach the number of fish that license is entitled to. That is a fair way to distribute the fish available to all affected by the changes proposed. Agencies are already checking the catches at the landings across the Northern part of the state. It will be no harder to track and mark an individual fisherman's catch on his ticket as the season progresses. This will also give you a better count on just how many fish are caught out of this area.

I know some will say this will require more employees and be a lot of trouble. Trouble? You don't have an idea of what real trouble means unless you are a commercial fisherman facing total loss of your rights to fish the waters near where you live. I think you need to be more inventive in order to give a fair decision on the matter.

Thank you,

Marsha Wilgis

Bodega Bay, CA

From: martin lyons [mailto:teachnfish@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:48 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Coastal and River Salmon Fishing

I'd like to give my support to Proposal 2-XA.

Thank you,

Martin Lyons

From: Matt Antosik [mailto:MAntosik@svse.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:38 AM
To: MLPAComments; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concern,

I enjoy fishing in the ocean, my family enjoys fishing in the ocean, and that I want to continue fishing in the ocean. Therefore I believe that Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal that achieves conservation with an appropriate level of balance.

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines

Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support

Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the "High" level of protection.

Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.

Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Thank you very much. I enjoy fishing in the ocean and want to continue to do so.

Thanks,
Matt

Matt Antosik
Corporate Merchandise Marketing Manager
San Jose, CA

From: Matthew Plut [mailto:sw44magnum@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:33 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA for the NCC MPA

I am a recreational fisherman, diver and a member of Coastside Fishing Club.

I am writing to urge the members of the BRTF and the Fish and Game Commission to support **Proposal 2-XA** because it not only satisfies, but exceeds the criteria defined for marine reserves by achieving a "High" level of protection while also satisfying the size and spacing requirements. It also meets the Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines.

Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster while placing an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPA's in the preferred size and spacing range.

In contrast to Proposals 1/3 and 4, which extend SMR's out to the state water boundaries and severely impact commercial and recreational users alike; **Proposal 2-XA** has struck a balance which places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection while achieving the desired "High" level of protection. **Proposal 2-XA** also affords the small boater safer access at Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay.

Proposal 2-XA is a strong, well balanced conservation proposal without the significant adverse socioeconomic impacts of Proposals 1/3 and 4 on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers.

It is for all of these reasons that there is massive support from local residents, land owners fishermen and conservationists for **Proposal 2-XA** and I strongly urge you to support **Proposal 2-XA**.

Respectfully,

Matthew S. Plut

From: Michael R. Ebert [mailto:mike@machineryandequipment.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:12 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA decision

As an avid recreational fisherman, I am asking that you please take into consideration those of us to whom fishing represents our main hobby. As a group, the recreational fishery is one of the strongest proponents of sustainability. We ask that we be considered when the final proposals are being voted upon. To disenfranchise this group by closing the seasons completely will be counterproductive to our common goal of improving the health of our ocean.

Please vote for proposal 2X-A

Regards,

Michael R. Ebert
President
San Francisco, CA

From: Mike Bassi [mailto:mdbassi@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:21 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To The Blue Ribbon Task Force,

Please understand I am a Father, Grandfather and a Conservationist. I have been my whole life. My father taught me to respect mother nature, to leave an area as clean as when you found it, and appreciate the wild. My Father taught me how to fish as far back as I can remember. It was always a great way to bond and have a great time. I always dreamed of passing that gift on to my children. I did with my daughters, but now it seems that it may end with my 3 year old Grandson. He may never know the feeling of baiting a hook, or reading the structure, the excitement of catching a fish, or swapping receipes for smoking salmon or grilling your own catch. To me there's nothing better than a tomatoe salad out of our backyard and fresh caught salmon on the grill. Ask my three daughters that grew up with me. The 2-XA plan is a well thought out plan with conservation and compromise as the lead function of the proposal. 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA. Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster. It places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the preferred size range. Proposal 2X-A meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines. This proposal and its individual components has the support of many in the coservation community. Only Proposal 2X-A has struck a real balance that has massive

support from local residents, land owner, fisherman/women and conservationists. Please be a part of something that works for everyone and support 2X-A. Thank you.

Mike Bassi
Pinole CA

From: Mike Giraudo [mailto:mike@intecsolutions.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 6:13 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

I am writing in favor of 2-XA. This prosal meets the requirments of the law, has high conservation ratings and is born of a compromise of all parties.

The coastal communities have been dealt a lot of heavy blows economically lately and the other proposals would spell disaster for them. Only 2-XA gives them a chance for survival as well as the fish.

Please support 2-XA

Mike Giraudo
Pacifica, Ca

From: Mike Marketello [mailto:marketello@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:29 AM
To: Mike Chrisman; MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

We are all to aware that once we give up fishing rights in California they are usually gone for good. I write today in favor of plan 2-XA which seem to be a better balanced plan in my opinion.

I have always has the concern that by closing too many areas to bottom fishing you only increase the chance of the leftover open areas to an increase in fishing pressure. Once these areas are fished too hard due to the other closures, they too will see a drop in fish populations and then the MLPA will be back for even more closures.

I believe it is better to try moderate area closures and if this doesn't produce improvement, then other types of restrictions be discussed. I can't see the wisdom in such huge closures that are being proposed, only to create new over fished locations to be up for additional closures in the future.

Regards

Mike Marketello
1120 Christopher CT
Hollister CA 95023

From: Mike Mork [mailto:m_mcapm@comcast.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 2:58 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject:

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force,

I am a 63 year old recreational fisherman who has followed the MLPA process. I strongly support Proposal 2-XA for the following reasons:

- It allows me to continue enjoying taking my boat out fishing once a week while at the same time achieving the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA.
- It is enforceable and meets Fish & Game guidelines.
- It places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection.
- It places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPA's in the preferred size range.

In contrast as I understand it Proposal 4 would close virtually all recreational bottom fishing at the Duxbury Reef. I fish the Reef about once a month during rockfish season and have never seen more than 3 or four boats there and hence can't believe its being "over fished".

The other recreational fishermen I talk to strongly support Proposal 2-XA. We all have heard rumors that Fish and Game and the other regulatory parties had decided before the hearings began what regulations would be put in place and the "public hearings" were just for show. Hopefully that is not true.

Sincerely,

Mike Mork
Mork Capital Management
Healdsburg, Ca

From: Paul Hammond [mailto:Paulh@lightspann.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:44 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA proposal 2-XA

BRTF,

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks for your consideration,

Paul Hammond
Berkeley, CA

From: Rick Edwards [mailto:rhe3000@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 2:13 PM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; MikeChrisman@resources.ca.gov
Subject: Support for Proposal 2-XA

March 31, 2008

Sirs:

I am writing in support of proposal 2-XA. It has many good attributes including the following: It is a strong conservation proposal that does not have significant financial impacts on recreational and/or commercial fisherman; It meets DFG feasibility guidelines and is enforceable; It has broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups and those in the conservation community; It places an emphasis of total ecosystem protection and places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPA's in the preferred size ranges.

Conversely, Proposal 4 would close all recreational bottom fishing at Duxbury Reef which would cripple the fishing industry out of San Francisco Bay. Proposal 2-Xa has good solutions for Bodega and Half Moon Bay while Proposal 4 would be devastating to the small boater. Proposals 4 and 13 both place an MPA at Saunders Reef resulting in a high impact to an area which is severely underrepresented in the Regional Stakeholder Group.

Only Proposal 2-XA is balanced reflectected by massive support from local residents, land owners, fishermen, and conservationists.

Sincerely,

Richard H. Edwards
Benicia, CA

From: Robert Hastings [mailto:likeshavingfun@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:11 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support of Proposal 2-XA

Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impacts on commercial and/or recreational fishermen and divers but:

„X Proposal 2-XA achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA „X Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines „X Proposal 2-XA is enforceable and will have broad public support „X Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range of fishing user groups „X Proposal 2-XA has a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPA cluster „X Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on total ecosystem protection with an emphasis on the „High“ level of protection.

„X Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range.
„X Proposal 2-XA has the support of a vast array of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.
„X Proposal 2-XA and/or its individual components has the support of many in the conservation community.

Thanks
Rob Hastings

From: Aqua Jet [mailto:aquajet@ewnet.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 2:34 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: 2-XA

Dear Sirs,

Please support proposal 2-XA on the table with the BRTF regarding MLPA allocations. I would strongly recommend that the science provided by Coastside Fishing Club, ASA and UASC is what your adoptions should be based on. As well as the enormous economic impact any of the other proposals would inflict on California. It appears from the our current situation that the State of California is in violation of the State Constitution in its excessive diversion of the Sacramento Delta water to the point of damaging the ecosystem and the Salmon stocks and others. I'm attaching a copy of the section of the Constitution that applies, as it seems you have forgotten it or ignored it.

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE 10A Water Resources Development

SECTION 1. The people of the State hereby provide the following guarantees and protections in this article for water rights, water quality, and fish and wildlife resources.

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE 10A Water Resources Development

SEC. 2. No statute amending or repealing, or adding to, the provisions of the statute enacted by Senate Bill No. 200 of the 1979-80 Regular Session of the Legislature which specify (1) the manner in which the State will protect fish and wildlife resources in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, Suisun Marsh, and San Francisco Bay system westerly of the delta; (2) the manner in which the State will protect existing water rights in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta; and (3) the manner in which the State will operate the State Water Resources Development System to comply with water quality standards and water quality control plans, shall become effective unless approved by the electors in the same manner as statutes amending initiative statutes are approved; except that the Legislature may, by statute passed in each house by roll call vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring, amend or repeal, or add to, these provisions if the statute does not

in any manner reduce the protection of the delta or fish and wildlife.

CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE 1 DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

Section 25. The people shall have the right to fish upon and from the public lands of the State and in the waters thereof, excepting upon lands set aside for fish hatcheries, and no land owned by the State shall ever be sold or transferred without reserving in the people the absolute right to fish thereupon; and no law shall ever be passed making it a crime for the people to enter upon the public lands within this State for the purpose of fishing in any water containing fish that have been planted therein by the State; provided, that the legislature may by statute, provide for the season when and the conditions under which the different species of fish may be taken.

Do the right thing and at a minimum enact proposal 2-XA and save our fishing rights.
Best regards,

Robert J Baer

Robert Baer (President)
Livermore, CA 94550

From: rrandpr2000@aol.com [<mailto:rrandpr2000@aol.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 11:23 AM
To: bfranko@coastsidefishingclub.com; MLPACComments;
governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: Marine Life Protection Act Support

Greetings,

I am writing to support Marine Life Protection Act (MPLA) proposal 2-XA. I am a native Californian who has enjoyed the outdoors and fishing, diving and hunting in our great state for most of my life. I also represent my family and extended family in communicating to you our wish to support proposal 2-XA.

Of possible further interest to you are my qualifications for making a statement in support of this proposal. I am a graduate of U.C. Berkeley, with a major in Natural Resources. While at Cal I was certified through their Underwater Scientific Research Diving Program. After becoming interested in wildlife law enforcement, I graduated in the top quarter of my class at the Department of Fish and Game's Warden Resource Academy at Napa Valley College in 1991. I have served as a warden in both the states of California and Wyoming. Although I am no longer in this field and I represent myself entirely as a private

citizen, my interest in resource issues is still keen. I am also a proud member and supporter of the Coastside Angler's club.

I support MPLA proposal 2-XA because it is a balanced achievement of many goals set out in the MPLA process. It meets the Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and is enforceable and will have broad public support. It proposes a strong backbone of marine reserves with seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve serves as the foundation of the MPAs and places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPAs in the "preferred" size range. Most tellingly, has the support of a large majority of commercial and recreational fishermen/women and divers.

Thank you very much for your attention to my concerns and for taking my opinion into account while making your decisions.

Regards,

Robert J. Reinhard

Novato, CA

From: Robert McGuire [mailto:fishfrfun@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 6:57 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Support Proposal 2-XA in the MLPA Process

To: Blue Ribbon Task Force

I am a local sport fisherman asking you to adopt Proposal 2-XA as the best of the proposals set forth in the MLPA process. Proposal 2-XA is better than the other proposals because it does not have the significant adverse socioeconomic impacts of the other proposals and yet offers well balanced and strong conservation plans.

I fish mostly from Bodega Bay and Half Moon Bay. Some of the other proposals would virtually eliminate my family from being able to participate in what has become a multi-generational activity. In some cases, such as in Proposal 4, the small boater would be virtually eliminated from the sport fishing fleet, especially when safety concerns are taken into consideration.

Proposal 2-X has the support of virtually every commercial and recreational fisherman that I am acquainted with. We recognize it as being the proposal that the general public can support because it is readily enforceable when many features of the competing proposals are not. Proposal 2-XA is not band-aid but rather protects the total ecosystem in a very high level. It not only achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the

MLPA but also meets the Department of Fish & Game feasibility guidelines. It protects seven core areas where a State Marine Reserve will serve as the foundation of the MPA cluster.

Please, please keep me, my kids and my grand kids on the water. Vote for proposal 2-XA as it is the best of choices.

Sincerely,
Robert L. McGuire
Rancho Cordova, CA

From: Bob Valentine [mailto:BValentine@valentinecorp.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:59 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: MLPA -- Proposal 2-XA

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to voice my support for MLPA Proposal 2-XA. I am a 40 year Bay Area native and have spent an enormous amount of time as a catch and release sports fisherman in SF Bay and the adjacent coastal water. It makes me very sad to contemplate that our elected politicians have formulated MPLA initiatives aimed at robbing me of the privilege to fish in my own back yard! These waters are PUBLIC resources and, as such, public trust doctrine mandates that they should be both preserved and protected in a balanced and thoughtful fashion so that all end users are not excluded in the process. A balanced proposal is needed.

While I realize and support the need for MLPA's along our coast, I object strongly to the political which trend penalizes and excludes the recreational fisherman from magnificent bounty of our coastal waters. There is a balance in engineering the MLPA's which will provide needed protection, but will also not exclude the tax paying recreational end users (boaters, fishermen, divers, etc) for using and access these PUBLIC areas. I believe proposal 2-XA strikes a good balance for all interests and I urge you to support this proposal.

Sincerely,

Robert O. Valentine Jr., P.E.

Valentine Corporation

From: rfabry@gmail.com [mailto:rfabry@gmail.com] On Behalf Of Bob Fabry
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:21 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please Recommend Package 4!

To The Marine Life Protection Act Blue Ribbon Task Force:

I support the network of marine protected areas in Package 4 for the North Central Coast Region of the Marine Life Protection Act. I ask you to select Package 4 as your preferred alternative. Package 4 gets the

highest marks from scientists, provides the highest level of protection to special places along the coast, and enjoys support from a wide range of interests.

Marine protected areas, especially fully protected marine reserves, are an investment in the future health of our coastal waters. Scientific studies confirm that marine reserves harbor more and bigger fish and support a greater diversity of life than other areas. Healthy oceans support our coastal communities and our economy. Please give California the strongest possible legacy of ocean protection by recommending Package 4.

Thank you!

Robert S. Fabry
Berkeley CA

From: Ron Ebert [mailto:fuzwaz2004@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:04 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support for 2XA

As a tax payer and avid fisherman I strongly support 2XA .

From: NautyBuoy1@aol.com [mailto:NautyBuoy1@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:05 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: mikeChrisman@resources.ca.gov
Subject: 2-XA

As a senior sport fisherman living in California since 1954, I urge you to approve proposal 2-XA.

This proposal is a well thought out and balanced approach to achieve conservation goals with the least impact economically on the commercial and recreational fisheries here in the great state of California. Please consider 2-XA. It is a balanced reasonable solution.

Ronald L. Mays
Novato, California

From: scott dreier [mailto:thescottdreier@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:45 AM
To: MLPAComments
Cc: governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman
Subject: MLPA Proposals

Hello,

I would like to thank everyone involved in the process of implementing an MLPA plan that makes the most sense for California. I think it is most important to strike the right balance between conservation, socio-economics, safety, and access. After reading the different proposals, I believe there is one proposal that strikes that balance the best. That would be proposal 2-XA. 2-XA achieves the goals of the MPLA, meets the DFG's feasibility requirements, is enforceable, and has broad public support. The 2-XA proposal provides total ecosystem protection without disenfranchising any of the concerned parties. We need a plan that works for everyone involved. I hope you join me in supporting proposal 2-XA and doing the right thing for everyone in California.

Thanks,
Scott Dreier
Concerned Voter

From: sean@wagstaff.info [<mailto:sean@wagstaff.info>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:15 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please support of MLPA Proposal number 2-XA

Sean Thomas Wagstaff
2460 Emerson St.
Palo Alto, CA 94301
650-804-1332

Attention: Blue Ribbon Task Force
MLPAComments@resources.ca.gov
Letter in support of MLPA Proposal number 2-XA

As it stands, MLPA Proposal 2-XA will hurt, but it strikes the fairest balance between conservation of species and conserving a way of life.

As a life-long advocate of wilderness and wildlife protection, I applaud the objectives of the MLPA and I sincerely hope the Task Force is able to achieve its conservation objectives. However, as a lifelong fisherman, I am concerned that the areas being set aside may be both out of proportion to the threat posed by sport angling, and that new regulations may fail to adequately take into account the consequences to traditions and values embodied in fishing and passed on from one generation to the next. I am also concerned about the economic impact that the loss of sport anglers will have in the communities in and around where we fish.

Sport fishermen have long been among the foremost champions of the marine environment. Few groups, as a whole, devote so much energy and caring to what lives under the waves. And few do so much to bring up new generations of ocean stewards, as my grandfather did for my father and he did for me. Adopting the wrong set of regulations (such as Proposal 4 or Proposal 13) could deprive us of the chance to fish near safe harbors, limit chances for good-quality local fishing, and steal

from our children the opportunity to learn about life on the sea. Such rules would silence not only leading advocates of marine life protection, but generations of advocates to come. Are we to teach our children that it's OK to eat fish, but only if they're raised in a pen, or caught by a factory ship in somebody else's back yard?

Economics

As the owner of small boat, I routinely take my children, wife, mother, father, siblings, and numerous friends and their children fishing. Our trips in and around the San Francisco Bay, Half Moon Bay, Bodega Bay and Monterey Bay contribute \$250 or more per day to local businesses. My annual spending (at local tackle stores, marine suppliers, and boat mechanics) contributes another \$2,000 to \$3,000 to local economies. Also, there are the dozen or so fishing licenses (\$300-\$400) paid for by my friends and family who fish exclusively from my boat. It's no exaggeration that my fishing hobby contributes between \$5,000 and \$10,000 per year to the economies of marine economies, as well as to state fish and wildlife conservation. Multiply these numbers by the thousands of fisherman who may hang up their rods as the result of poor regulations and you'll see the magnitude of the loss.

Consider that the annual "take" on my boat (in a good year) is around two hundred fish and crab. Fishing is far more an excuse to spend time on the ocean with friends and family than it is an exercise in killing marine life. My impact on the marine environment is tiny, but my economic impact is large. (I spend, on average, about \$50 per fish caught.) If fishing is too restricted by MLPA rules, I'll have zero impact on marine life, but my money, and my interest, will vanish, too. (Proposals 4 and 13, for example, virtually eliminate fishing south of Half Moon Bay and around Duxbury Reef, the two areas where I fish with my friends and children most often, because these areas are among a handful of ocean waters that we can safely reach in my small boat.)

Proposal 2-XA isn't perfect, as far as sport fishermen are concerned, but I understand your task force must strike a balance between many opposing interests. This proposal comes closest can meet the MLPA objectives, while still protecting a way of life for future generations.

Sincerely,

Sean Wagstaff

Angler

From: sean@wagstaff.info [<mailto:sean@wagstaff.info>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:15 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Please support of MLPA Proposal number 2-XA

Sean Thomas Wagstaff
2460 Emerson St.
Palo Alto, CA 94301
650-804-1332

Attention: Blue Ribbon Task Force
MLPACComments@resources.ca.gov
Letter in support of MLPA Proposal number 2-XA

As it stands, MLPA Proposal 2-XA will hurt, but it strikes the fairest balance between conservation of species and conserving a way of life.

As a life-long advocate of wilderness and wildlife protection, I applaud the objectives of the MLPA and I sincerely hope the Task Force is able to achieve its conservation objectives. However, as a lifelong fisherman, I am concerned that the areas being set aside may be both out of proportion to the threat posed by sport angling, and that new regulations may fail to adequately take into account the consequences to traditions and values embodied in fishing and passed on from one generation to the next. I am also concerned about the economic impact that the loss of sport anglers will have in the communities in and around where we fish.

Sport fishermen have long been among the foremost champions of the marine environment. Few groups, as a whole, devote so much energy and caring to what lives under the waves. And few do so much to bring up new generations of ocean stewards, as my grandfather did for my father and he did for me. Adopting the wrong set of regulations (such as Proposal 4 or Proposal 13) could deprive us of the chance to fish near safe harbors, limit chances for good-quality local fishing, and steal from our children the opportunity to learn about life on the sea. Such rules would silence not only leading advocates of marine life protection, but generations of advocates to come. Are we to teach our children that it's OK to eat fish, but only if they're raised in a pen, or caught by a factory ship in somebody else's back yard?

Economics

As the owner of small boat, I routinely take my children, wife, mother, father, siblings, and numerous friends and their children fishing. Our trips in and around the San Francisco Bay, Half Moon Bay, Bodega Bay and Monterey Bay contribute \$250 or more per day to local businesses. My annual spending (at local tackle stores, marine suppliers, and boat mechanics) contributes another \$2,000 to \$3,000 to local economies. Also, there are the dozen or so fishing licenses (\$300-\$400) paid for by my friends and family who fish exclusively from my boat. It's no exaggeration that my fishing hobby contributes between \$5,000 and \$10,000 per year to the economies of marine economies, as well as to state fish and wildlife conservation. Multiply these numbers by the thousands of fisherman who may hang up their rods as the result of poor regulations and you'll see the magnitude of the loss.

Consider that the annual "take" on my boat (in a good year) is around two hundred fish and crab. Fishing is far more an excuse to spend time on the ocean with friends and family than it is an exercise in killing marine life. My impact on the marine environment is tiny, but my economic impact is large. (I spend, on average, about \$50 per fish caught.) If fishing is too restricted by MLPA rules, I'll have zero impact on marine life, but my money, and my interest, will vanish, too. (Proposals 4 and 13, for example, virtually eliminate fishing south of Half Moon Bay and around Duxbury Reef, the two areas where I fish with

my friends and children most often, because these areas are among a handful of ocean waters that we can safely reach in my small boat.)

Proposal 2-XA isn't perfect, as far as sport fishermen are concerned, but I understand your task force must strike a balance between many opposing interests. This proposal comes closest to meeting the MLPA objectives, while still protecting a way of life for future generations.

Sincerely,

Sean Wagstaff

Angler

From: Steve Dillon [<mailto:Dilbyrocks@rcn.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 11:36 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Support 2XA

Dear Blue Ribbon Task Force

In support of Proposal 2-XA

When the dust settles and the MLPA moves on to the next region I sincerely hope that in its wake we will have a meaningful network of MPA's that fulfills the conservation goals and socio-economic considerations necessary to make it a success for our State. Recreational boaters and anglers are part of the great diversity of California and deserve fair and honest consideration in the design and implementation of the MLPA. Safety considerations and fair access for small and larger vessels to enjoy our unique coastal heritage are important. In protecting our coastal waters I believe people still need to be able to experience it first hand and pass that on to our children.

Proposal 2-XA is the only choice that truly meets all these goals

Sincerely
Steve Dillon
1745 Lake St.
San Mateo Ca, 94403

From: Tad Houston [<mailto:tadhouston@hotmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 5:18 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: I support 2-XA

I wrote this letter last week, but do not see it in the public comments. This is NOT a form letter, I thought this up myself, thank you

Hello, my name is Tad Houston, and i own a sport fishing boat slipped in bodega. I have been a fisherman all my life, and the ocean is my church. I help feed my family with salmon, rockcod, halibut and crab throughout the year. I feel proposal 2xa is the most balanced between conservation and public access to fishing around our ports. It is the only propasal that lets me safely get out and fish near port in Bodega. Safety is a big concern for me on the ocean, please help me stay safe, and continue to enjoy the fresh seafood i have been providing my family for many years to come.

I support 2-XA
Its the ONLY way!

Thanks, Tad

From: Robinson, Tahirih (T.D.) [mailto:TRobinson@shaklee.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 10:25 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

BRTF

I urge you to approve Proposal 2-XA. It meets and exceeds the science and conservation goals of the MLPA, while incorporating the least socio-economic impact on fishermen, coastal communities and marine related business. It strikes a balance between preservation, conservation, and sustainable use; the other proposals do not.

Proposal 2-XA meets Department of Fish and Game feasibility guidelines and it is enforceable. This is the only proposal to have broad support from a wide range user groups.

Thanks for your Consideration
Tahirah Robinson
Pinole, CA

From: Terry Lewis [mailto:terrynmary@earthlink.net]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:41 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: In support of 2xa

To whom it may concern

As a lifelong California resident and an avid fisherman,I am writng in support of proposal 2xa.I feel that it is the only I can live.I want to see my grandkids able to fish and enjoy the outdoors as I have.It is the only proposal I can support.Even though I believe it is the lesser of several evils,I reanlise that something has to be done .I am generally against all the MLPA's.I have watched the demise of our resources over the years and am personally tired of the fisherman always the one to pay the price for Californias terrible mismanagement of our fisheries.I would much rather see our tax and license money go to solving the real problem.WATER. NO WATER,NO FISH!!

I believe this will help the coastsides communities that have taken the brunt of all these closures and hate to see so many businesses hurt by these closures anymore than they already have
I have always acted in a responsible and respectful way regarding our fishery. Please endorse and except 2xa and take a step in the fair and right direction.
Sincerely and respectfully,
Terry Lewis
IGFA world record holder and taxpayer

From: Thomas [<mailto:anadramous@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:18 AM
To: MLPAComments; governor@governor.ca.gov; Mike Chrisman; tpate@scwa2.com
Subject: Support MLPA Proposal 2-XA

Ladies and Gentleman:

As an avid conservationist, I am taking the time to write to you to urge your support of Proposal 2-XA.
Proposal 2-XA is a well balanced and strong conservation proposal that does not have significant adverse socioeconomic impact our fishing heritage.

This proposal achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA and clearly meets the Dept of Fish and Games feasibility guidelines. Proposal 2-XA places an emphasis on contributing to a network of MPA's in the preferred size range with a strong backbone of marine reserves that includes seven core areas where a state Marine Reserve serves as the foundation placing a high level of emphasis on total ecosystem protection. Proposal 2-XA is the only proposal to have broad public support and is reasonably enforceable.

In stark contrast, Proposal 4 would remove the most viable fishing opportunities virtually ending recreational fishing out of SF Bay, Half Moon Bay, and Bodega Bay. Proposal 2-XA provides good solutions in the spirit of the MLPA whereas Proposal 4 creates unsafe conditions for small boaters.

In closing, I would like to thank you for allowing me some of your valuable time to express some feeling that are dear to me and my family. I have been fishing our local waters all of my life and I hope to be able to impart my passion, experience, and genuine love of the Pacific Ocean and our fishing heritage that it provides on my children and hopefully future grand children. The loss of this natural instinctive heritage would be devastating socially and economically on our great State.

Sincerely,

Thomas L. Pate, PE

From: Tim and Colleen Machado [<mailto:mac@snowcrest.net>]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 8:17 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Best Proposal

Sirs,

By this e-mail I wish to express my support for Proposal 2-XA as being the best, most comprehensive, and fair means of expediting the current MLPA process.

It is the only proposal that meets DFG feasibility and enforcement guidelines, has broad support from fishery user groups, and achieves the scientific and conservation goals of the MLPA process.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion.

Timothy Machado

From: Lewis, Thomas A. (GE Infra, Energy) [mailto:Thomas2.Lewis@ge.com]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:14 PM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Blue Ribbon Task Force Proposals

Sirs,

I am writing in support of Proposal 2-XA. It will allow us to to have a high level of protection we need. It achieves the conservation goals of the MPLA and meets DFG guidelines. This Proposal has the support of both the fishing and conservation communities. It is the winning solution.

Sincerely,

Tom Lewis

From: Tom Radovich [mailto:hltcal@comcast.net]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 7:23 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: In support of Proposal 2-XA

Our family supports

Proposal 2-XA

From: waynechssi@aol.com [mailto:waynechssi@aol.com]

Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 9:42 AM

To: MLPAComments

Subject: Proposal 2-XA

To whom it may concerned:

I have been a fisherman and diver in the SF bay area for more than 30+ years!

I support Proposal 2-XA!

Best regards,

Wayne Cheung
30556 Mallorca way
Union city CA94587

From: Odum Jr, William (WG) [mailto:William.OdumJR@dow.com]
Sent: Monday, March 31, 2008 12:11 AM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Proposal 2-XA

Please support Proposal 2-XA. My family and I love to fish, hunt and be outdoors as often as we can. By doing so we contribute to the economy in numerous ways by buying fuel, bait, tackle, fishing and hunting license, camping, boat launching fees and so on. We are also the eyes and the ears of the Department of Fish and Game by being outdoors. Take us out of the loop and you allow the poachers and other misfits the opportunity to exploit our natural resources at our expense. So we urge you to support Proposal 2-XA

Sincerely,
William, Kelly, William, Shanay and Kasey Odum